arXiv:1704.08410v1 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 27 Apr 2017

Vortex Mass in a Superfluid

Tapio Simula
School of Physics and Astronomy, Monash University, Victoria 3800, Australia

We consider the inertial mass of a vortex in a superfluid quantum gas. In contrast to the conclusion by Thouless and Anglin, we obtain a vortex mass that is well defined and is determined microscopically and self-consistently by the elementary excitation energy of the kelvon quasiparticle localised within the vortex core. The mass, Magnus force, and Berry phase of the vortex could be measured experimentally in superfluid Bose and Fermi gases using currently available methodologies.

Introduction—The mass of a vortex in a superfluid has been debated in the literature for many decades with predictions ranging from it being practically zero or infinite to being ill-defined. The vortex mass candidate, $m_{\rm field} = E_{\rm field}/c_s^2$, where c_s is the speed of sound, as noted by Popov [1], Duan and Leggett [2, 3] and many others, seems to result in a logarithmically divergent vortex mass for large distances R relative to the vortex core size r_c because the incompressible kinetic energy $E_{\rm field}$ associated with the superflow velocity field of a static vortex is proportional to $\ln(R/r_c)$. An alternative approach due to Baym and Chandler [4] is to consider not the energy to create the vortex itself but the kinetic energy cost to move it. This seems to result in a negligible vortex mass equal to the bare mass $m_{\rm bare} = \pi\rho_s r_c^2$, where ρ_s is the superfluid mass density, that essentially corresponds to the mass of the fluid displaced by the vortex core [5]. In Fermi superfluids such induced hydrodynamic mass is know as the Kopnin mass [6–9].

Thouless and Anglin considered a vortex pinned by an external potential that moves in a circular path and concluded that the concept of the vortex mass would not be well defined and would depend on the details of the measurement process [10]. However, application of such a pinning potential strongly affects the Kelvin modes localised at the vortex core [11–16], which means that in the presence of such a pinning potential the vortex mass cannot be decoupled from the properties of the applied pinning potential even if the vortex would be dragged through the superfluid adiabatically [17].

Here we approach this conundrum by considering a self-propelling vortex that moves in a superfluid Bose–Einstein condensate spontaneously along a circular orbit due to the self-induced asymmetry in the superflow. Observing the vortex motion from the rotating frame of reference leads to an unambiguous definition of the inertial mass of such a vortex in terms of the energy of the unique kelvon quasiparticle of the elementary excitation spectrum of the superfluid. The kelvon is the 'fingerprint' of the quantised vortex and its excitation energy is determined by a self-consistent theory that contains the information pertinent to the microscopic origin of the vortex mass in a Bose–Einstein condensate.

We obtain the inertial rest mass m_0 of the vortex in terms of observables that can be readily measured in cold atom experiments and conclude that a vortex in a superfluid is heavy and its mass is finite and well defined spectroscopically by two measurables; the superfluid density and the energy of the kelvon quasiparticle. Finally, we suggest how the Berry phase, the Magnus force, and the rest mass of a vortex in a superfluid could be measured experimentally in superfluid Bose and Fermi gases.

Model—Our starting point for the derivation of the vortex mass is the dynamical Hartree–Fock–Bogoliubov theory of the superfluid Bose gas, which is known to yield an elementary excitation spectrum that agrees with the second order accurate Beliaev theory [18]. In this theory the dynamics of the condensate wave function $\psi(\mathbf{r},t)$ are determined by the generalised Gross–Pitaevskii equation

$$i\hbar\partial_t\psi(\mathbf{r},t) = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r},t)\psi(\mathbf{r},t) + g\Delta(\mathbf{r},t)\psi^*(\mathbf{r},t) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{r},t) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2 + V_{\rm ext}(\mathbf{r},t) + g|\psi(\mathbf{r},t)|^2 + 2g\rho(\mathbf{r},t) - iD(\mathbf{r},t)$. In Eq. (1), m is the mass of the superfluid particle, g determines the strength of the s-wave interactions in the system, $n(\mathbf{r},t) = |\psi(\mathbf{r},t)|^2$, $\rho(\mathbf{r},t)$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{r},t)$ are the condensate, non-condensate and pair-potential densities, respectively, $V_{\rm ext}(\mathbf{r},t)$ includes all external pinning, trapping and other potentials and the non-Hermitian term $iD(\mathbf{r},t)$ accounts for condensate growth and loss processes such as dissipation due to the interaction with non-superfluid atoms.

The internal potentials $\rho(\mathbf{r},t)$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{r},t)$ involve summations over all quasiparticle states and are determined *self-consistently* by the relations

$$\rho(\mathbf{r},t) = \sum_{qp}\big\{f_{qp}(t)[u_q^*(\mathbf{r},t)u_p(\mathbf{r},t) + v_q^*(\mathbf{r},t)v_p(\mathbf{r},t)] - 2{\rm Re}[g_{qp}(t)u_q(\mathbf{r},t)v_p(\mathbf{r},t)] + \delta_{qp}|v_q(\mathbf{r},t)|^2\big\} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\Delta(\mathbf{r},t) = -\sum_{qp}\big\{[2f_{qp}(t)+\delta_{qp}]v_q^*(\mathbf{r},t)u_p(\mathbf{r},t) - g_{qp}(t)u_q(\mathbf{r},t)u_p(\mathbf{r},t) - g_{qp}^*(t)v_q^*(\mathbf{r},t)v_p^*(\mathbf{r},t)\big\}. \quad (3)$$

The last term in $\rho(\mathbf{r},t)$ is proportional to the Lee–Huang–Yang contribution to the ground state energy due to the quantum fluctuations [19] and it yields a non-zero quantum depletion even at zero temperature, the effects of which have recently been observed experimentally

[20, 21]. The evolution of the quasiparticle amplitudes $u_q(\mathbf{r},t)$ and $v_q(\mathbf{r},t)$ are determined by the Bogoliubov–de Gennes equations

$$\begin{aligned} i\hbar\partial_t u_q(\mathbf{r},t) = &\quad \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{r},t)u_q(\mathbf{r},t) - \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r},t)v_q(\mathbf{r},t) \\ i\hbar\partial_t v_q(\mathbf{r},t) = &-\mathcal{M}^*(\mathbf{r},t)v_q(\mathbf{r},t) + \mathcal{V}^*(\mathbf{r},t)u_q(\mathbf{r},t) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

expressed in terms of the operators $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{r},t) = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2 - \mu + V_{\rm ext}(\mathbf{r},t) + 2gn(\mathbf{r},t) + 2g\rho(\mathbf{r},t)$ and $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{r},t) = g\psi^2(\mathbf{r},t) + g\Delta(\mathbf{r},t)$, where μ is the chemical potential. The quasiparticle distribution functions $f_{qp}(t) = \langle \alpha_q^\dagger \alpha_p \rangle$ and $g_{qp}(t) = \langle \alpha_q \alpha_p \rangle$ are expectation values of products of quasiparticle creation $\alpha_q^\dagger$ and annihilation α_q operators.

For each vortex nucleated in the condensate wavefunction $\psi(\mathbf{r},t)$, a new low-energy quasiparticle state emerges in the spectrum of elementary excitations [22]. For a one vortex system such a kelvon quasiparticle is localised inside the vortex core [23–25] and has the excitation energy $E_k = \hbar\omega_k = \langle u_k(\mathbf{r},t)|i\hbar\partial_t|u_k(\mathbf{r},t)\rangle = \langle v_k(\mathbf{r},t)|i\hbar\partial_t|v_k(\mathbf{r},t)\rangle$ and amplitudes $u_k(\mathbf{r},t) = |u_k(\mathbf{r},t)|e^{i[2\theta+\phi_u(\mathbf{r},t)-\omega_k t]}$ and $v_k(\mathbf{r},t) = |v_k(\mathbf{r},t)|e^{i[\phi_v(\mathbf{r},t)-\omega_k t]}$. Here θ is the polar angle in the vortex centered coordinate system and $\phi_u(\mathbf{r},t)$ and $\phi_v(\mathbf{r},t)$ are slowly varying, smooth real functions. The physics of the kelvon quasiparticle [11] corresponds to the classical Kelvin wave motion [26] in which the vortex core is displaced from and orbits on a circular path around its own equilibrium position with angular frequency ω_k [27]. Since the kelvon quasiparticle density is localised within the vortex core, its energy is very sensitive to the vortex core structure. Importantly, the kelvon quasiparticle also determines the experimentally observed orbital motion of a vortex in the centre of trapped Bose–Einstein condensates [28–31]. In typical cold atom experiments such a Kelvin mode, sometimes called the anomalous mode or the vortex precession mode [15, 23–25, 32–35], has the lowest excitation energy in the system $E_k < \hbar\omega_{\rm trap}$, where $\omega_{\rm trap}$ is the usual harmonic trapping frequency.

Vortex velocity and the transverse force—To obtain the equation of motion for an isolated quantised vortex in a two-dimensional Bose–Einstein condensate, we may consider a generic vortex state $\psi_v(\mathbf{r},t) = [x - x_v + i(y - y_v)]\sqrt{e(\mathbf{r},t)}e^{iS(\mathbf{r},t)}$, where $S(\mathbf{r},t)$ is a smooth real function and $e(\mathbf{r},t)$ is defined by $|\psi_v(\mathbf{r},t)|^2 = |\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_v|^2 e(\mathbf{r},t)$. The exact form of $\psi_v(\mathbf{r},t)$ is determined self-consistently by Eq. (1). The equation of motion of the vortex is obtained explicitly by linearising the formal solution of the generalized time-dependent Gross-Pitaevskii equation, Eq. (1), and finding the position $\mathbf{r}_v(t+\delta t)$ of the phase singularity of the vortex wavefunction $\psi_v(\mathbf{r}, t+\delta t)$, where δt is an infinitesimal time increment [36]. The resulting velocity of the vortex $\boldsymbol{v}_v(\mathbf{r},t) = \delta\mathbf{r}_v/\delta t$ is

$$\boldsymbol{v}_v(\mathbf{r},t) = \boldsymbol{v}_s(\mathbf{r},t) - \frac{\hbar\hat{\mathbf{e}}_z \times \nabla e(\mathbf{r},t)}{2me(\mathbf{r},t)}, \quad (5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{v}_s(\mathbf{r},t) = \kappa\nabla S(\mathbf{r},t)/2\pi$ is the embedding superfluid velocity in the vicinity of the vortex core and $\kappa = h/m$ is the quantum of circulation. The vortex velocity depends on the gradients of the embedding phase and the condensate density in the vicinity of the vortex. Numerical experiments reveal that the last term in Eq. (5) requires a multiplicative constant to account for non-local static pressure effects on the vortex velocity [36]. Such details are omitted here since they do not affect our results and conclusions.

Equation (5) may be re-expressed in the form

$$m\tilde{n}(\mathbf{r},t)\boldsymbol{\kappa} \times [\boldsymbol{v}_v(\mathbf{r},t) - \boldsymbol{v}_s(\mathbf{r},t)] - \frac{\pi\hbar^2\tilde{n}(\mathbf{r},t)}{me(\mathbf{r},t)}\nabla e(\mathbf{r},t) = 0, \quad (6)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = \kappa\hat{\mathbf{e}}_z$ and $\tilde{n}(\mathbf{r},t)$ is the condensate density in the absence of the vortex. We interpret Eq. (6) as a force balance equation $\mathbf{F}_{\rm Magnus} + \mathbf{F}_{\rm buoyancy} = 0$ for the vortex, where the Magnus force, also known as the Kutta–Joukowski lift, is

$$\mathbf{F}_{\rm Magnus} = m\tilde{n}(\mathbf{r},t)\boldsymbol{\kappa} \times [\boldsymbol{v}_v(\mathbf{r},t) - \boldsymbol{v}_s(\mathbf{r},t)] \quad (7)$$

and the gradient force due to the inhomogeneous condensate density, which originates from the quantum pressure,

$$\mathbf{F}_{\rm buoyancy} = -\frac{\pi\hbar^2}{m}\frac{\tilde{n}(\mathbf{r},t)}{e(\mathbf{r},t)}\nabla e(\mathbf{r},t) \quad (8)$$

can in general point in any direction causing the vortex to accelerate or decelerate. As such, effects of vortex 'friction' are accounted for by this buoyancy force.

A couple of remarks are in place: (i) in strictly uniform systems, $\mathbf{F}_{\rm buoyancy} = 0$ so that in the absence of additional forces the vortex moves at the local superfluid velocity $\boldsymbol{v}_v(\mathbf{r},t) = \boldsymbol{v}_s(\mathbf{r},t)$ in accordance with the Kelvin–Helmholtz theorem of classical dynamics of incompressible invicid fluids, (ii) in Eq. (5) there is no *explicit* Magnus force on the vortex due to the motion of the non-condensate. Instead, such effects involving the non-condensate are included in the vortex dynamics implicitly and self-consistently through their influence on the density $n(\mathbf{r},t)$ and velocity $\boldsymbol{v}_s(\mathbf{r},t)$ of the *condensate* wave function, through $\psi(\mathbf{r},t)$ in Eq. (1).

Vortex mass—To determine the inertial mass of the vortex we first consider a Bose–Einstein condensate trapped within a cylindrical hard-wall bucket potential of radius $R_\circ$ such that the condensate density $n(\mathbf{r},t)$ is practically constant everywhere in the fluid except within the vortex core and near the walls of the bucket. In this case, and at low temperatures, $\mathbf{F}_{\rm buoyancy} \approx 0$ and the vortex motion as observed in the laboratory is determined by the condition $\boldsymbol{v}_v^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r},t) = \boldsymbol{v}_s^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r},t)$. The result is that the vortex travels along a circle with a position dependent orbital angular frequency $\omega_v(r_v)$. In this case, the circular motion of the vortex is due to the self-induced asymmetry in the superflow around the vortex. Equivalently, the embedding superflow $\boldsymbol{v}_s^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r},t)$ that drives the motion of the vortex can be viewed to be generated by

an image vortex of opposite sign of circulation placed outside of the bucket. Directly integrating the Gross-Pitaevskii equation confirms that the observed frequency $\omega_v(r_v) = \omega_v(0)/[1-(r_v/R_\circ)^2]$ agrees with the solution of the corresponding point-vortex model [36], which can be mapped onto the exactly soluble two-dimensional electrostatic problem of a charge inside a conducting ring.

In order to relate the Magnus force to the mass of the superfluid vortex, we make a transformation to a reference frame that rotates at the angular speed $\omega_v(r_v)$ of the vortex. In such a frame, the vortex is stationary, $\boldsymbol{v}_v^{\rm rot}(\mathbf{r},t) = 0$. However, the superfluid velocity in the rotating frame $\boldsymbol{v}_s^{\rm rot}(\mathbf{r},t)$ is equal to its value $\boldsymbol{v}_s^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r},t)$ in the laboratory frame. This follows from the fact that the quantum mechanical transformation to the rotating frame $\psi^{\rm rot}(\mathbf{r}',t) = e^{-i\omega_v t L_z/\hbar}\psi^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r},t)$, where the orbital angular momentum operator L_z is the generator of the rotation, leaves the gradient of the phase unchanged. The force balance equation for the vortex in the rotating frame thus yields $\mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm centrifugal} = \mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm Magnus}$. The combination of $\mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm centrifugal} = -m_v\boldsymbol{\omega}_v^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r}) \times \boldsymbol{v}_v^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r},t)$ and $\mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm Magnus} = -m\tilde{n}(\mathbf{r},t)\boldsymbol{\kappa} \times \boldsymbol{v}_s^{\rm rot}(\mathbf{r},t) = -m\tilde{n}(\mathbf{r},t)\boldsymbol{\kappa} \times \boldsymbol{v}_v^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r},t)$ yields the result for the velocity dependent vortex mass per unit length $m_v(v_v) = 2\pi\hbar\tilde{n}(r_v)/\omega_v(r_v)$. The inertial rest mass per unit length m_0 of the vortex is obtained by considering the limit of $r_v \to 0, v_v \to 0$ and the result is

$$m_0 = \frac{2\pi\hbar n_0}{\omega_k} = \frac{\kappa^2}{2\pi}\frac{\rho_0}{E_k}m. \tag{9}$$

In Eq. (9) n_0 is the background condensate density at the origin in the absence of the vortex, $\rho_0 = mn_0$, and ω_k is the frequency of the kelvon quasiparticle, which equals the orbital angular frequency of the vortex in the limit when the vortex approaches the centre of the bucket. Although $v_v \to 0$ as $r_v \to 0$, the orbital angular frequency $\omega_v(0)$ saturates to a non-zero value that equals the kelvon frequency ω_k. Equation (9) shows that the inertial mass of the vortex is indeed well defined and is determined microscopically by the excitation energy E_k of the kelvon quasiparticle of the vortex. The kelvon frequency ω_k is determined self-consistently by the Bogoliubov–de Gennes equations, Eq. (4), and it carries complete information of the influences on the vortex dynamics such as the near field at the vortex core, the far field away from the core as well as the effects of quantum fluctuations and thermal atoms.

Comparing our result, Eq. (9), with the vortex mass $2\pi\hbar\rho_s/m\omega_I = m_{\rm bare}$ of Baym and Chandler [4] shows that the inertial mode frequency $\omega_I \gg \omega_k$ [37] in the Baym–Chandler mass should be replaced by the kelvon frequency ω_k. For cold atom systems with chemical potential $\mu = gn_0 \gg \hbar\omega_k$, Eq. (9) yields $m_0 = 2m_{\rm bare}\mu/\hbar\omega_k$, such that the inertial vortex mass is in general much greater than the bare mass, in agreement with the observations by the Zwierlein group [38, 39]. Our result is also consistent with the Kopnin mass $\pi\hbar n/\omega_f$ in fermonic superfluids [6] to the extent that the level spacing $\hbar\omega_f$ of the Caroli–de Gennes–Matricon modes [40–42] can be associated with the energy $\hbar\omega_k$ of the kelvon.

The suggestion by Thouless and Anglin [10], that the mass of a vortex would not be well defined, stems from the fact that any pinning potential applied to a vortex core inherently affects the kelvon frequency. Here we are able to avoid this subtle issue by allowing the vortex to move free from localised external potentials, which makes it possible to relate the inertial vortex mass to the frequency of the elementary kelvon excitation. Furthermore, if one considers self-trapped cold atom gases held together by long-range particle interactions one may avoid using any external potentials altogether [20].

Equation (9) sheds light on the apparent issue of the logarithmic divergence of the incompressible kinetic energy associated with a *static* vortex. In a Bose–Einstein condensate a calculation of the field mass yields $m_{\rm field} = E_{\rm field}/c_s^2 = \frac{\pi\hbar^2}{g}\ln(R/r_c)$, where R is the radius of the condensate and r_c is approximately the size of the vortex core [11]. This suggests that the vortex mass would become infinite in the $r_c/R \to 0$ limit. We may also express Eq. (9) in the form $m_0 = \frac{\pi\hbar^2}{g}\frac{\mu}{\hbar\omega_k}$. For a harmonically trapped condensate, in the non-interacting $g \to 0$ limit the chemical potential $\mu = \hbar\omega_{\rm trap} = \hbar\omega_k$ [35] and $\ln(R/r_c) \approx 1$ showing that our result and the logarithmically divergent mass definitions converge toward the same finite value in this limit. However, in typical cold atom experiments $\mu/\hbar\omega_k \gg \ln(R/r_c)$. This means that a vortex in an interacting system is actually *heavier* than the usual logarithmically divergent prediction.

The reason is that most of the mass of the vortex m_0 is due to the mass m_k of the kelvon quasiparticles. The situation is analogous to the case of an electron whose mass is readily obtained from the measurement of its cyclotron frequency that relates the Lorentz and centrifugal forces, *cf.* Eq. (9), but the energy of the classical electromagnetic field, analogous to the kinetic energy of $\psi(\mathbf{r},t)$ in Eq. (1), is divergent due to the singularity at the location of the electron and leads to the well known issues in the evaluation of the mass of the electron. Equations (4), however, are the semi-classical analog of the Dirac equation and uncover the mass of the vortex. The vortex core of the condensate forms a harmonic oscillator potential $m_k\omega_k^2 r^2/2 = mgn_0r^2/4m_kr_c^2$ for the kelvons with oscillator frequency ω_k such that $(i\hbar\partial_t + \mu)u_k(\mathbf{r},t)m/m_k \approx \hbar\omega_k u_k(\mathbf{r},t) \approx (-\hbar^2\nabla^2/2m_k + m_k\omega_k^2 r^2/2)u_k(\mathbf{r},t)$. The effective mass of a kelvon is therefore $m_k \approx m\mu/\hbar\omega_k$. This naturally agrees with an estimate based on the Heisenberg uncertainty relation $\Delta x_k \Delta p_k \approx \hbar/2$, with uncertainties in the vortex position $\Delta x_k \approx r_c$ and momentum $\Delta p_k \approx m_k\omega_k r_c$, which yields $m_k \approx \hbar/2\omega_k r_c^2 = m\mu/E_k$. At zero temperature the number of kelvons N_k per unit length L in the vortex core is $N_k/L = \int |v_k(\mathbf{r},t)|^2 dv/L \approx m_0/m_k \approx 2m_{\rm bare}/m$. Hence, the mass and the total

energy per unit length of the vortex, which are presumably related by $E_{\rm tot} = m_0 c_s^2/\sqrt{1-v_{\rm rel}^2/c_s^2}$, where $v_{\rm rel} = v_v - v_s$, are large mostly due to the *zero point motion of the vortex*. Although Eq. (9) seems to admit an infinite vortex mass in the form of a zero-energy kelvon mode, this is unphysical in light of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle [43].

It is instructive to also consider the case of a condensate confined by a harmonic oscillator potential $V_{\rm ext} = m\omega_{\rm trap} r^2/2$. The derivation of the vortex mass follows the same steps as before but now the vortex dynamics include a non-zero buoyancy force leading to the relation $\mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm centrifugal} = \mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm Magnus} + \mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm buoyancy}$. However, the force balance in the laboratory frame demands that $\mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm Magnus} + \mathbf{F}^{\rm rot}_{\rm buoyancy} = -m\tilde{n}(\mathbf{r},t)\boldsymbol{\kappa} \times \boldsymbol{v}_v^{\rm lab}(\mathbf{r},t)$ and therefore the equation for the vortex mass is the same as for the uniform case and has no explicit dependence on $V_{\rm ext}(\mathbf{r},t)$. Nevertheless, there is a major qualitative difference between the uniform and harmonically trapped systems. In the former the vortex moves with the local superfluid velocity $\mathbf{v}_s(\mathbf{r},t)$ induced by a virtual image vortex of opposite sign of circulation placed outside the bucket. In this case, the mass of the vortex is weakly dependent on its position since $v_{\rm rel} = 0$ and the speeding up of the vortex by the factor of $1/(1-r_v^2/R_{\rm c}^2)$ is not due to its mass being reduced but because of the reduction in the energy due to the attractive interaction with the image vortex. However, the motion of the vortex in a harmonic trap depends on both the asymmetry of the superflow around the vortex and the buoyancy force due to the density gradient. In this case the mean superflow in the vicinity of the vortex core cannot be equal to the velocity of the vortex, $v_{\rm rel}^2 > 0$, which increases the mass of the vortex as it moves toward the trap edge. More importantly, the vortex loses its weight because of the reduction in the local condensate density. As in the uniform case, the total energy is also reduced due to the interaction with the image.

Geometric phase of the vortex—In a uniform superfluid the geometric Berry phase $\gamma(C)$ and the Magnus force of the vortex are related by [44]

$$\gamma(C) = i \oint_C \langle \Psi | \nabla_{\mathbf{R}} \Psi \rangle \cdot d\mathbf{R} = \int_C \frac{F_M}{\hbar v_v} da = 2\pi w N(C), \tag{10}$$

where C denotes the closed orbital path of the vortex, w is the winding number and $N(C)$ is the number of atoms enclosed by C. This profound connection between the topological charge of the quantised vortex and its dynamical behaviour also reveals that the vortex is a boson since on exchanging the positions of two $w = 1$ vortices the system acquires a phase of 2π per atom enclosed by the exchange path. In this case the equality between the Magnus and centrifugal forces leads to the expression for the vortex mass

$$m_v(C) = \hbar\gamma(C) / \int_C \boldsymbol{\omega}_v(C) \cdot d\mathbf{a} \tag{11}$$

in terms of the Berry phase. In superfluids with more complex order parameter structure such as spinor BECs, the vortices are in general anyons and may possess non-Abelian exchange phases.

Experimental prospects—Superfluid Bose and Fermi gases provide a promising experimental platform for precision measurements of the Berry phase, Magnus force and inertial mass of a quantised vortex. An off-centre vortex in such systems can be created and its orbital angular frequency $\omega_v(r_v)$ as a function of its position observed. The measured orbital frequencies in both Bose [28–31] and Fermi [38, 39] gases have been found to be in good agreement with the mean-field theory [35, 45–48]. Extrapolating such frequency data to $r_v = 0$ yields the kelvon frequency ω_k. This, in combination with a measurement of the condensate density, yields the inertial rest mass m_0 of the vortex. A systematic study of the vortex mass could be performed using cold atom gases trapped in bucket potentials by varying the radial position and the core size of the vortex in the superfluid. Uniform trapping geometries suitable for such experiments are already being used by several groups [49–52].

Fortuitously, the same experimental setup for measuring the kelvon frequencies could also be used to measure the Berry phase of a vortex in a superfluid for the first time. The Berry phase of a vortex could be obtained using its discretised form

$$\gamma(C) = -\mathrm{Im}\left(\log \prod_i^P \int \psi^*(\mathbf{r}, t_i)\psi(\mathbf{r}, t_{i+1}) dv \right), \tag{12}$$

where the closed path C of the vortex is sampled at P different vortex positions and the integration is over all space. Experimentally, the integrands in Eq. (12) could be extracted from an interferogram of two wave functions acquired at time intervals $\delta t = t_{i+1} - t_1$ during which the vortex is allowed to travel a distance of the order of its core diameter. The measured value of $\gamma(C)$ should be compared with the predicted value $2\pi w N(C)$, where the number of enclosed atoms $N(C)$ could possibly be obtained to shot-noise limited accuracy [53]. Using the measured values of the Berry phase and the (constant) vortex speed, the Magnus force F_M can be deduced using Eq. (10) and be compared with an alternative measurement based on Eq. (7).

Conclusions—The inertial mass of a quantised vortex in a superfluid Bose–Einstein condensate is determined microscopically by the condensate density and the self-consistent elementary excitation frequency of the kelvon quasiparticle. The vortex is heavy and, protected by the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, its mass does not suffer from logarithmic divergencies.

I am grateful to Victor Galitski, Andrew Groszek, Kris Helmerson, David Paganin and Martin Zwierlein for useful discussions. This work was financially supported by the Australian Research Council via Discovery Projects No. DP170104180 and No. DP130102321.

[1] V. N. Popov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **64**, 672 (1973).
[2] J.-M. Duan and A. J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1216 (1992).
[3] J.-M. Duan, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 12381 (1994).
[4] G. Baym and E. Chandler, J. Low Temp. Phys. **50**, 57 (1983).
[5] E. Chandler and G. Baym, J. Low Temp. Phys. **62**, 119 (1986).
[6] N. B. Kopnin, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **27**, 417 (1978).
[7] E. B. Sonin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 87 (1987).
[8] G. E. Volovik, *The Universe in a Helium Droplet* (Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, 2003).
[9] E. B. Sonin, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 134515 (2013).
[10] D. J. Thouless and J. R. Anglin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 105301 (2007).
[11] L. Pitaevskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **40**, 646 (1961).
[12] E. P. Gross, Il Nuovo Cimento **20**, 454 (1961).
[13] T. Isoshima and K. Machida, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 2203 (1999).
[14] T. P. Simula, S. M. M. Virtanen, and M. M. Salomaa, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 033614 (2002).
[15] T. P. Simula, T. Mizushima, and K. Machida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 020402 (2008).
[16] T. P. Simula and K. Machida, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 063627 (2010).
[17] S. M. M. Virtanen, T. P. Simula, and M. M. Salomaa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 230403 (2001).
[18] A. Griffin, T. Nikuni, and E. Zaremba, *Bose-Condensed Gases at Finite Temperatures* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).
[19] T. D. Lee, K. Huang, and C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **106**, 1135 (1957).
[20] M. Schmitt, M. Wenzel, F. Böttcher, I. Ferrier-Barbut, and T. Pfau, Nature (London) **539**, 259 (2016).
[21] R. Chang, Q. Bouton, H. Cayla, C. Qu, A. Aspect, C. I. Westbrook, and D. Clément, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 235303 (2016).
[22] T. Simula, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 023630 (2013).
[23] T. Isoshima and K. Machida, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **66**, 3502 (1997).
[24] R. J. Dodd, K. Burnett, M. Edwards, and C. W. Clark, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 587 (1997).
[25] S. M. M. Virtanen, T. P. Simula, and M. M. Salomaa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2704 (2001).
[26] W. L. K. Thomson, Philos. Mag. **10**, 155 (1880).
[27] The movie V1mode_1_0.mov in the Supplemental Material of Ref. [22] visualizes the dynamics of the kelvon.
[28] B. P. Anderson, P. C. Haljan, C. E. Wieman, and E. A. Cornell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2857 (2000).
[29] V. Bretin, P. Rosenbusch, F. Chevy, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and J. Dalibard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 100403 (2003).
[30] E. Hodby, S. A. Hopkins, G. Hechenblaikner, N. L. Smith, and C. J. Foot, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 090403 (2003).
[31] D. V. Freilich, D. M. Bianchi, A. M. Kaufman, T. K. Langin, and D. S. Hall, Science **329**, 1182 (2010).
[32] T. P. Simula, T. Mizushima, and K. Machida, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 053604 (2008).
[33] D. L. Feder, A. A. Svidzinsky, A. L. Fetter, and C. W. Clark, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 564 (2001).
[34] A. L. Fetter, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 043617 (2004).
[35] A. L. Fetter, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 647 (2009).
[36] A. G. Groszek and co-authors (2017), in preparation.
[37] G. Baym, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 110402 (2003).
[38] T. Yefsah, A. T. Sommer, M. J. H. Ku, L. W. Cheuk, W. Ji, W. S. Bakr, and M. W. Zwierlein, Nature (London) **499**, 426 (2013).
[39] M. J. H. Ku, W. Ji, B. Mukherjee, E. Guardado-Sanchez, L. W. Cheuk, T. Yefsah, and M. W. Zwierlein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 065301 (2014).
[40] C. Caroli, P. G. De Gennes, and J. Matricon, Phys. Lett. **9**, 307 (1964).
[41] S. M. M. Virtanen and M. M. Salomaa, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 14581 (1999).
[42] T. Mizushima, M. Ichioka, and K. Machida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 150409 (2008).
[43] E. Byckling, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **32**, 367 (1965).
[44] D. J. Thouless, P. Ao, and Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3758 (1996).
[45] R. G. Scott, F. Dalfovo, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 185301 (2011).
[46] R. Liao and J. Brand, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 041604 (2011).
[47] L. Koens, T. P. Simula, and A. M. Martin, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 063614 (2013).
[48] D. K. Efimkin and V. Galitski, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 023616 (2015).
[49] S. Eckel, J. G. Lee, F. Jendrzejewski, C. J. Lobb, G. K. Campbell, and W. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 063619 (2016).
[50] G. Gauthier, I. Lenton, N. M. Parry, M. Baker, M. J. Davis, H. Rubinsztein-Dunlop, and T. W. Neely, Optica **3**, 1136 (2016).
[51] B. Mukherjee, Z. Yan, P. B. Patel, Z. Hadzibabic, T. Yefsah, J. Struck, and M. W. Zwierlein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 123401 (2017).
[52] S. Tempone-Wiltshire, S. Johnstone, and K. Helmerson, Opt. Express **25**, 296 (2017).
[53] M. Gajdacz, A. J. Hilliard, M. A. Kristensen, P. L. Pedersen, C. Klempt, J. J. Arlt, and J. F. Sherson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 073604 (2016).